

MINUTES
YORK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
York Hall, 301 Main Street
November 9, 2005

MEMBERS

Christopher A. Abel
Nicholas F. Barba
Anne C. H. Conner
John R. Davis
Alexander T. Hamilton
Alfred E. Ptasznik, Jr.
John W. Staton

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Alfred Ptasznik called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

The roll was called and all members were present. Staff members present were J. Mark Carter, Timothy C. Cross, Amy Parker, Earl Anderson, and James E. Barnett, Jr.

REMARKS

Chair Ptasznik stated that the Code of Virginia requires local governments to have a Planning Commission, the purpose of which is to advise the Board of Supervisors on land use and planning issues affecting the County. The responsibility is exercised through recommendations conveyed by resolutions or other official means and all are matters of public record. He indicated that the Commission is comprised of citizen volunteers, appointed by the Board, representing each voting district and two at-large members.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Hamilton moved to amend and adopt the minutes of the regular meeting of October 12, 2005, replacing Mr. Barba's name with Mr. Hamilton's in a motion to adopt Resolution PC05-43 (page 22). The amended minutes were adopted unanimously by roll call vote.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application No. UP-686-05, Premier Properties USA, Inc.: Request for a Special Use Permit, pursuant to Sections 24.1-306 (Category 13, No. 2) and 24.1-466(g) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, to authorize establishment of a regional shopping center of more than 80,000 square feet of gross floor area located at 165 and 175 Water Country Parkway and further identified as Assessor's Parcel Nos. 11-4-3 and 11-91. The properties, containing 233.11 acres (parcel no. 11-4-3) and 3.67 acres (parcel no. 11-91) are located at the southeast quadrant of the southern Humelsine Parkway (Route 199)/Interstate 64 interchange and south of Water Country Parkway (Route 640). The property is zoned EO (Economic Opportunity) and is designated for Economic Opportunity development in the Comprehensive Plan. (Public hearing continued from October 12, 2005 meeting.)

Ms. Amy Parker, Senior Planner, reviewed the application and the revisions proposed since the public hearing was opened in October and continued by the Commission. She noted the staff recommendation to adopt draft Resolution PC05-45(R).

Mr. Ptasznik inquired about the proposal to establish a Design Review Committee and its structure, particularly the proposal permitting the Board of Supervisors to make revisions. **Ms. Parker** noted the recommendation, referenced also in the proposed resolution, refers only to the Board authorizing revisions relating to the composition of the Committee. The particulars of the document, once approved, would not be subject to further action by the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Ptasznik re-opened the continued public hearing.

Mr. David Zoba, partner with Premier Properties USA, Inc., 6045 Sunset Lane, Indianapolis, IN, spoke in behalf of the applicant. He explained that Premier Properties seeks to "create a sense of place, order and excitement, where people like to be, to see people and be seen, and have an enjoyable shopping, entertaining, and dining experience." Mr. Zoba believed The Marquis in York County could be its most exciting project to date and bring more order than exists in local shopping environments. He believed the project would generate substantial tax revenues. Mr. Zoba acknowledged there still are some issues for the applicant to address.

Mr. Zoba introduced **Mr. Ryan Cronk**, Vice President, Premier Properties USA, Inc., who offered to answer questions.

Mr. Davis asked what the applicant's target market would be.

Mr. Cronk said the aim is to capture a market that is not served in Newport News or York County, to attract retailers representing a wide array of tastes, and to attract customers of a broad demographic range.

Mr. Barba addressed traffic as a significant concern and wanted to know the status of the applicant's traffic studies. **Mr. Cronk** said the obstacles include the complexities of working with a number of entities, including federal and state transportation departments, Busch Properties, and others. He acknowledged the necessity to conform to York County requirements and resubmit traffic studies to state and federal agencies. He spoke of meetings the applicant had with the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation and some of the traffic configurations discussed or under consideration. He was not certain of the outcome but said the applicant would have to make the traffic work in accordance with the County ordinances and requirements.

Mr. Hamilton inquired about pedestrian connections within the proposed shopping areas.

Mr. Cronk noted that Mr. Carter had provided the applicant with written guidelines concerning pedestrian connectivity. He said a concept plan by its nature is somewhat flexible but the intent is to ensure pedestrian connectivity as well as driving lanes and parking spaces to serve the retail shops. He added that some of those details will have to be worked out after the anchors and other retailers have been finalized because the particular retail mix will have an impact on traffic and pedestrian decisions.

Mr. Ptasznik thought it was more desirable to exclude vehicular traffic within the retail shopping area. **Mr. Cronk** said there are philosophical differences among shopping centers or retailers on that issue. The applicant theorizes the traffic component in the center of the shopping area helps to ensure the area thrives in all weather conditions, and angled storefront parking provides convenient access to retailers. He said vehicles would not be permitted in the center areas during special events such as concerts.

Chair Ptasznik closed the public hearing.

Mr. Staton observed that Town Center in Bowie, Maryland, allows vehicular traffic in the center of the shopping complex along with angled parking and sidewalks, and it seems to work out well.

Mr. Abel had read an item in the Plainfield, Illinois newspaper highlighting the applicant's Plainfield project and indicating that it was popular and successful among shoppers. He anticipated the same high level of results for The Marquis.

Mr. Barba thought it had the potential to be a first-rate project and commended the applicants for their respect for and management of historic resources on the site.

Mr. Davis believed the proposed project could be a great asset for the County.

Mr. Ptasznik said the County could take pride in introducing the concept to the area and believed it would be good for economic development and for the citizens. He commended staff for recognizing the value of and coordinating the complicated archaeological, historical, and environmental concerns.

Mr. Hamilton moved adoption of proposed Resolution PC05-45(R).

Resolution No. PC05-45(R)

On motion of Mr. Hamilton, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A SPECIAL USE
PERMIT TO AUTHORIZE A RETAIL CENTER OF MORE THAN 80,000
GROSS SQUARE FEET IN FLOOR AREA AT 165 AND 175 WATER
COUNTRY PARKWAY

WHEREAS, Premier Properties USA, Inc. has submitted Application No. UP-686-05, which requests a special use permit, pursuant to Section 24.1-466(g) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, to authorize a retail center of more than 80,000 square feet of gross floor area on property located at 165 Water Country Parkway (Route 640) and a portion of 175 Water Country Parkway and further identified as Assessor's Parcel Nos.11-91 and a portion of 11-4-3; and

WHEREAS, said application has been referred to the York County Planning Commission in accordance with applicable procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on this application; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the public comments with respect to this application;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 9th day of November, 2005 that Application No. UP-686-05 be, and it is hereby, transmitted to the York County Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval to authorize a retail center of more than 80,000 square feet of gross floor area located at 165 Water Country Parkway (Route 640) and a portion of 175 Water Country Parkway and further identified as Assessor's Parcel Nos.11-91 (GPIN I13c-0012-1173) and a portion of 11-4-3 (GPIN H13b-3795-3227) subject to the following conditions:

1. This use permit shall authorize a retail center of more than 80,000 square feet of gross floor area located at 165 Water Country Parkway (Route 640) and a portion of 175 Water Country Parkway and further identified as Assessor's Parcel Nos.11-91 and a portion of 11-4-3. This use permit shall be applicable only to that area identified as "Phase I" on Sheet C2.0 of the plans referenced in Condition #2 below.
2. A site plan prepared in accordance with the provisions of Article V of the York County Zoning Ordinance shall be submitted to and approved by the York County Department of Environmental and Development Services, Division of Development and Compliance, prior to the commencement of any construction activities on the

subject parcel. Except as modified herein, said site plan shall be in substantial conformance with the plans titled “The Marquis, York County, Virginia,” S.U.P. Re-submittal, Sheets C.01, C1.1, C1.2, C1.3, C3.1 and C3.2, prepared by Landform, dated September 30, 2005 and received by the Planning Division October 3, 2005 and Sheets 2.0, 2.1 and 2.2, received on October 10, 2005, and “Typical Main Street Cross Section, the Marquis,” prepared by JPRA Architects, dated September 30, 2005 and received by the Planning Division on October 3, 2005. Building elevations shall be in general conformance with elevations titled “Williamsburg Row,” sheet numbers 4 through 15, prepared by JPRA Architects, dated August 31, 2005 and received by the Planning Division September 23, 2003, and shall be subject to the design review and approval process set forth herein. For the purposes of this Special Use Permit authorization, the maximum total amount of floor area in the subject phase of the project shall be 800,000 square feet.

3. Prior to site plan approval, the applicant shall secure wetlands permits required under Chapter 23.1 of the County Code, and any permits or approvals required from the Army Corps of Engineers for development impacting wetlands.
4. All signage on the property shall be in conformance with Article VII of the Zoning Ordinance. Freestanding identification signage for the overall project shall be limited to a single monument sign for each individual public street frontage bordering the property (Interstate 64, including the exit ramp; Route 199; Water Country Parkway, extended) and shall be in substantial conformance with the monument sign elevation titled “Freestanding/Monument, The Marquis,” Sheet 3, prepared by JPRA Architects, dated September 30, 2005 and received by the Planning Division on October 3, 2005. Freestanding identification signs for any separate outparcels shall be permitted in accordance with the terms of Article VII. Internal freestanding directional signage shall conform to Zoning Ordinance Section 24.1-707(r).
5. Pedestrian access and parking lot landscape dividers shall be located as depicted on the plan sheet labeled “Staff amendments,” Sheet C2.2 and dated October 10, 2005, a copy of which is included in this resolution by reference. The ultimate site design shall also include any additional pedestrian ways and/or landscape dividers as may be deemed required in the course of final site plan review. The pedestrian access way labeled “major pedestrian access way” shall be designed as a minimum 15-foot wide landscape island containing a minimum 5-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to a minimum 10-foot wide landscaped area. All other delineated pedestrian access ways shall be designed as minimum 10-foot wide islands containing minimum 4-foot wide sidewalks adjacent to minimum 6-foot wide landscaped areas.
6. Prior to application for site plan approval, a design review committee, formed and governed by the document “Design Review Committee Structure” dated November 2, 2005, and made a part of this resolution by reference, shall be established for the review and approval of proposed building and signage plans. Site and building plans

shall conform to the Design Guidelines section of this document and such other standards as are established herein.

7. Access to the proposed development shall be as generally depicted on the conceptual plans referenced in Condition #2 above, and including any modifications as required by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). Such access arrangements from Route 199 and the proposed connections with the Grove Interchange ramp system of Interstate 64 shall be subject to review and approval by the Virginia Department of Transportation and by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in accordance with such procedures and requirements as those agencies determine appropriate. The adequacy of the proposed traffic network shall be documented and analyzed in a Traffic Impact Study prepared in accordance with all applicable standards for such studies and approved by VDOT and FHWA where applicable as required by statute. The Traffic Impact Study shall document the improvements necessary to serve the needs of the proposed development and to yield a minimum Level of Service of C. Where the existing conditions provide a current Level of Service of less than C, the improvements shall be designed to at least maintain the current volume to capacity ratio without further degradation through the design year, plus two years. The improvements necessary to accommodate the traffic impacts of the proposed development shall be the responsibility of the applicant. In the event transportation system improvements cannot be designed to accommodate the proposed amount of retail development and achieve the LOS standard, then the size (floor area) of the proposed commercial space shall be reduced accordingly from that depicted on the Concept Plan.

The alignment and design of the proposed main access road, which is depicted on the Concept Plan as a “New State Road,” shall be approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation and, in the event of a connection to the Interstate 64 ramp system, the Federal Highway Administration. The road shall be designed as a limited access facility with no breaks on its north side other than a possible service/employee access connection to Water Country USA, and a possible pull-off/parking area to provide access to any interpretive area established in conjunction with the historic/archaeological resources to be preserved, both subject to VDOT’s review and approval. Access breaks (entrances into the proposed development) on the south side shall be as generally depicted on the referenced concept plans, shall not exceed a total of five (5) for this phase of the project, and shall be subject to review and approval by VDOT as to such design, geometrics and traffic control/signalization standards as it deems appropriate.

In the event the connection to the Interstate 64 ramp system is not approved by VDOT and/or the Federal Highway Administration, or is still under review at the time the applicant wishes to commence detailed design and engineering work for the Phase I development, the applicant shall be responsible for demonstrating the adequacy of the Route 199 access point to serve as the sole access to the proposed Phase I development. Such documentation shall be provided through the submission and approval, by VDOT, of a traffic impact analysis (which may be a sub-section of the

overall project Traffic Impact Study referenced above). In addition, the applicant shall be responsible for securing a commitment from VDOT that the Phase I main access road will be eligible, upon completion, for acceptance by the Virginia Department of Transportation. In the event the Phase I main access road will not be eligible for acceptance by VDOT, it shall be considered a private road/commercial access and all future maintenance responsibility shall rest with the applicant/developer.

The referenced Traffic Impact Studies shall accompany the first site plan submission for the proposed development. Site Plan approval shall be contingent upon approval of the Traffic Impact Study by VDOT and, as necessary, the Federal Highway Administration. No Land Disturbing Activity Permits shall be issued for the proposed development unless the Traffic Impact Study and roadway design has been approved. In the event the authorized project is to be constructed in phases and will involve multiple site plan submissions, the initially submitted traffic study may include recommendations for a phased approach to constructing the transportation infrastructure.

8. Except as noted herein, preservation of historic resources on the property shall be fulfilled in accordance with the applicant's historical resources summary received by the Planning Division on October 3, 2005, which is included in this resolution by reference.

Prior to any clearing or grading activities in the area of historical resources site nos. 394, 396 or 1026 as identified in the report "Phase II Archaeological Significance Evaluation of Sites 44YO0394, 44YO0395, 44YO0396, and 44YO1026 at the Whittaker's Mill Tract in York County, Virginia," prepared by James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., dated August 2005 and received by the Planning Division on September 1, 2005, a Phase III archaeology study shall be conducted in accordance with Virginia Department of Historical Resources (VDHR) guidelines. This shall include full recovery, documentation and archiving of all found historical artifacts on the site. Artifacts shall be archived at an antiquities repository facility constructed in accordance with applicable VDHR curation guidelines (36CFR, part 79), and shall be available to the public for educational and research purposes. In coordination with the County and VDHR, the applicant shall initiate application to the VDHR for nomination of preserved eligible sites to the National Register of Historic Places.

There shall be no disturbance of the gun emplacement/redoubt located within site No. 394 as identified in the above-referenced Phase II archaeological report, and a 50-foot undisturbed buffer shall be maintained surrounding the feature. Said buffer shall be delineated on approved site and grading plans, and shall be clearly demarcated on-site prior to clearing or grading activities in its vicinity.

Prior to site plan approval, an easement shall be established for the perpetual preservation of historical sites over the area so referenced on plan Sheet C1.2. The easement area shall also include the undisturbed buffer associated with the gun

emplacement/redoubt area referenced above. Said easement shall be granted to the County or other public or non-profit organization dedicated to the discipline of historic preservation and associated public education, and shall contain provisions for the maintenance and protection of historic sites and interpretive facilities as referenced herein.

No later than at time of completion of the proposed state road within the Phase I portion of the subject site, the applicant shall be responsible for the construction of an interpretive building in the area of site Nos. 394/395, as identified in the above-referenced Phase II archaeological report, for the purpose of displaying educational information, including, but not limited to, photographs and text describing the artifacts and the associated history of the site. The County, in coordination and cooperation with VDHR and the Virginia Association of Museums, shall approve the proposed architecture, size, location, and interior design of the building.

9. Free standing and building lighting shall be full cut-off fixtures that are shielded and directed downward and level to the ground to prevent off-site illumination. The maximum height for on-site light fixture poles shall be as follows:

Pedestrian Walks and Plazas:	18 feet
Internal Streets and Drives:	25 feet
Parking Areas:	30 feet

Freestanding signage shall be internally lit, except where exterior lighting is directed downward and fully shielded. Illumination levels shall not exceed 0.5-foot candle at any exterior property line. Neon lighting exposed or contained within non-opaque fixtures shall not be permitted for signage or for building or other structure accents. All lighting schemes and lighting fixtures shall be consistent with the lighting recommended by the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA). Acceptable light sources shall include incandescent and metal halide lamps, and should produce a color temperature close to daylight. Other sources may be approved by the Design Review Committee; however, mercury vapor sources are not permitted.

10. A 45-foot wide undisturbed landscape buffer shall be maintained abutting the western border of the property adjacent to the Route 199 and I-64 rights-of-way, including the interstate exit ramp.
11. Outdoor storage of retail goods or other materials shall not be permitted.
12. Rooftop HVAC, electrical and similar utilities shall be screened from view of any street right-of-way, circulation drive, parking area or pedestrian way.
13. Calculation of minimum required parking spaces shall be exclusive of spaces utilized for cart storage uses. Parking areas that are located along public right-of-way

frontages shall be appropriately screened/buffered from view using fencing, walls (maximum 42 inches in height), or hedges.

14. In accordance with the provisions of Section 24.1-115(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, significant modifications to this approval as determined by the Zoning Administrator shall require that a new use permit application be submitted for review. Modifications can be administratively approved if the Zoning Administrator determines the modification to be minor.
15. In accordance with Section 24.1-115(b)(7) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, a certified copy of the resolution authorizing this special use permit shall be recorded prior to application for site plan approval at the expense of the applicant in the name of the property owner as grantor in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court.

Application No. ST-11-05, York County Board of Supervisors: Consider amendments to certain sections of the York County Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 20.5, York County Code).

Mr. J. Mark Carter, Assistant County Administrator, presented a summary of the memorandum to the Commission dated October 28, 2005, in which the staff recommended approval. He noted that one change is needed in the draft language – Section 20.5-92(c)(3) [8th line] needs to read: “property owners identified *below*” rather than “above.” He suggested that some additional amendments might be necessary after the Board adopts the 2025 Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Ptasznik opened the public hearing; hearing no speakers, he closed the hearing.

Mr. Hamilton moved to adopt proposed Resolution PC05-46(R), to include the minor change noted by Mr. Carter.

Resolution No. PC05-46(R)

On motion of Mr. Hamilton, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF APPLICATION NO. ST-11-05, WHICH PROPOSES AMENDMENT OF THE YORK COUNTY SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE (CHAPTER 20.5, YORK COUNTY CODE) BY REVISING, ADDING AND DELETING VARIOUS SECTIONS TO UPDATE, CLARIFY AND SUPPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOOD SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE

WHEREAS, the York County Board of Supervisors has sponsored Application No. ST-11-05 to allow consideration of various amendments intended to update, clarify and supplement the provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance in accordance with good subdivision and land development practice; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered these proposed amendments, as outlined and described in the October 28, 2005 briefing memorandum and its attachments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on the proposed amendments in accordance with applicable procedures; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 9th day of November, 2005 that it does hereby recommend approval of Application No. ST-11-05 to amend various sections of the York County Subdivision Ordinance as contained in the attachments to the October 28, 2005 briefing memorandum to the Commission, said attachments being made a part of this resolution by reference.

Application No. ZT-99-05, York County Board of Supervisors: Consider amendments to the following sections of the York County Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 24.1, York County Code)

Mr. J. Mark Carter, Assistant County Administrator, summarized the staff memorandum to the Commission dated October 26, 2005, in which the staff recommended approval.

Chair Ptasznik opened the public hearing.

Vernon Geddy III, Esq., 1177 Jamestown Road, spoke in support of proposed Sec. 24.1-705.1. Special sign regulations applicable to regional medical centers. He received a letter addressed dated 26 August 2004, from FMG Design, Inc., regarding “Sentara Williamsburg Regional Medical Center Architectural Graphics,” which letter is attached to the Minutes. Mr. Geddy introduced Mr. Bob Graves, administrator of Sentara, and others who supported the request contained in the letter.

Mr. Ferdinand Meyer V, FMG Design, Inc., Houston, Texas, supported the adoption of proposed Sec. 24.1-705.1 for the reasons contained in the letter mentioned by Mr. Geddy. He believed the psychological stresses people experience when trying to find medical facilities during an emergency support more liberal signage than presently is permitted. Sign ordinances designed for commercial uses do not always reach the standard that is needed for a medical center, he believed, and seconds lost while searching for emergency medical aid could make the difference between life and death.

Hearing no others, **Chair Ptasznik** closed the public hearing.

Ms. Conner referred to proposed Sec. 24.1-474. Standards for commercial reception hall or conference center, noting there is no restaurant at the marina mentioned in the Higginbotham letter (attached) that was mentioned in the staff report. She inquired how the applicant, who does not own the marina, was qualified to apply for a use permit for a restaurant accessory to a marina. **Mr. Carter** explained that the applicant, Byrds by the Bay, had received site plan approval to establish a restaurant accessory to a marina, the marina being a pier owned by the applicant that would accommodate approximately 27 boat slips. The proposal to allow commercial reception halls in the WCI district only by Special Use Permit allows the application of performance standards similar to many of those that are already in the ordinance for restaurants accessory to marinas. Mr. Carter added that if the proposed text amendment is adopted, the applicant would need to submit an application for a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Barnett, referring to Sec. 24.1-411. Standards for Senior Housing (Housing for Older Persons), explained that he and **Mr. Carter** had discussed the proposed language following extensive research and discussion with attorneys and others who had specific interest in and experience with federal and state laws, exceptions to housing statutes, and exceptions for older people. The proposal would add flexibility to the Zoning Ordinance that it does not have. Following some discussion the members agreed generally with the intent and language contained in the proposal.

Mr. Barba moved to adopt proposed Resolution PC05-47.

Resolution No. PC05-47

On motion of Mr. Barba, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF APPLICATION NO. ZT-99-05, WHICH PROPOSES AMENDMENT OF THE YORK COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE (CHAPTER 24.1, YORK COUNTY CODE) BY REVISING, ADDING AND DELETING VARIOUS SECTIONS TO UPDATE, CLARIFY AND SUPPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOOD ZONING PRACTICE

WHEREAS, the York County Board of Supervisors has sponsored Application No. ZT-99-05 to allow consideration of various amendments intended to update, clarify and supplement the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in accordance with good zoning practice; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered these proposed amendments, as outlined and described in the October 26, 2005 briefing memorandum and its attachments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on the proposed amendments in accordance with applicable procedures; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 9th day of November, 2005 that it does hereby recommend approval of Application No. ZT-99-05 to amend various sections of the York County Zoning Ordinance as contained in the attachments to the October 26, 2005 briefing memorandum to the Commission, said attachments being made a part of this resolution by reference.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Carter distributed the “Development Activity Update” dated November 9, 2005. He added that an upcoming application for another private kennel Special Use Permit had been inadvertently omitted from the development report.

Mr. Carter reported on the status of the proposed revision to the Comprehensive Plan. The Board of Supervisors held a public hearing October 25, 2005 and a work session November 1. It will allow additional public comment on land use designation changes at its November 15th meeting and then will meet in another work session November 22, and adoption of the revised Comprehensive Plan is scheduled tentatively for the regular meeting December 6, 2005. He said the Supervisors generally accepted the Commission’s recommendations contained in Resolution PC05-38 adopted September 14, 2005. Mr. Carter complimented the members and staff who had worked very hard on the project.

Mr. Davis asked what the state required with regard to proposed land rezonings. Mr. Carter said the Code of Virginia requires advertisements in a local newspaper of an intention to consider an amended Comprehensive Plan. For rezonings, the Code requires newspaper advertisements and, depending upon how many parcels are proposed to be rezoned, individual notifications to property owners.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports.

COMMISSION REPORTS AND REQUESTS

Chair Ptasznik asked the members to review the Planning Commission Bylaws because the staff is working on revisions and additions for the Commission’s consideration.

Chair Ptasznik suggested that the members make every attempt to attend all Commission meetings and to be punctual.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

SUBMITTED:

Phyllis P. Liscum, Secretary

APPROVED:

Alfred E. Ptasznik, Jr., Chair

DATE: _____